

MYSORE BETTING TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.

Motion to consider

Sri VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Betting Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Betting Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, I had given a notice of motion to the effect that the Bill be circulated for eliciting opinion under rule 53 (2).

Mr. SPEAKER.—That comes only after the consideration stage.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Rule 53 (2) says that any member may move an amendment to the effect that the Bill be circulated for eliciting opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What you refer to is rule 51 (2) and not 53 (2). You seem to have an old copy. At this stage no amendment is allowed.

Sri. M. C. NARASIMHAN.—According to the copy I have, there are two stages : One is leave to introduce and the other is the consideration stage. Today, this amending Bill is put down for consideration and not for introduction. According to rule 53 (2) it is as follows :

“At this stage no amendments to the Bill may be moved, but if the member in charge moves that the Bill be taken into consideration, any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by a date to be specified in the motion.”

Accordingly I have already given a notice of motion that it be circulated for eliciting opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My copy is the latest. What is 53 (2) in your book is 51 (2) in the latest book.

I have not received a copy of the motion.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—May I be permitted to move the motion now as I have given a written motion already?

Mr. SPEAKER.—“At this stage no amendments to the Bill may be moved, but if the member in charge moves that his Bill be taken into consideration, any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by a date to be specified in the motion.”

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, may I just remind the House that the question of amendment will come after I make my observations. I simply said that it may be taken into consideration and it has been so mentioned by the Chair. At this stage, I have got a right to say a few words and it is after that that the question of amendment might come in at all. I am sure that my friend Sri. Narasimhan, knowing him as I do, after hearing me, will certainly have no amendment, if I carry conviction to him that the scope of this Bill is very very clear. There is absolutely no complication in the law as it exists today, i.e., before the Bill is taken into consideration, the Government have got a right to fix a rate at anything below 25 per cent. It is not clear as to whether with regard to the various kinds of races, different rates could be adopted or notified by the Government and it is only a power which is not very clearly stated there that is sought to be introduced now in this Bill. It is only clothing the Government to reduce the tax or have different taxes for various races by notification. Whenever a notification is issued, it will come to the notice of the members. The way of fixing rates that is existing now is sought to be removed. It is section (8) (a) that is to be added to the Statute and section (8) (a) provides that it might be open to the Government to examine properly all the circumstances prevailing to prescribe different rates. I therefore submit to the House that the Bill is a very innocuous one and there is absolutely no scope for any great debate on this. I am sure the members will kindly find it possible to accept it unanimously.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can move the motion now.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Mysore Betting Tax (Amendment), Bill, 1958, be circulated for eliciting opinion before 1st April 1958.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the Mysore Betting Tax (Amendment), Bill, 1958, be circulated for eliciting opinion before 1st April 1958.”

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I do not wish to go into all aspects of the amending Bill placed for our consideration. Nor do I wish to reply to the Hon'ble the Finance Minister who has just introduced this Bill. That can be taken at a later stage. My motion is that it should be circulated for eliciting opinion, for one reason that this amending Bill seeks to get power for the Government to reduce the taxes in respect of certain races. So far as the original Act is concerned, in Betting Tax Act, i.e. the 1932 Regulation did not provide for categorisation of Races; the later Act *viz.* the Mysore Race Course Licencing Act of 1952—also has not provided for any such categorisation of various races. These do not introduce a distinction between jamkhana races and other races. This amending Bill goes beyond the powers under the original Act. Nor does the amending Bill seek to introduce any corresponding changes in the definition as is necessary. Under these circumstances and since the particular amending Bill provides for a reduction of taxes, I say that this Bill be circulated for eliciting opinion. It is absolutely necessary. There is no warrant for reduction of this tax at all. Even while introducing the Bill, the Hon'ble Finance Minister did not give any reason why the rates of taxes should be reduced. After all, it should be remembered that this tax structure has been prevailing for the past 24 years, since 1st February 1933. I do not understand why, after nearly 25 years, the Government should have discovered that there is a necessity for reducing

the taxes. I do not know why the Government—why the Hon'ble the Finance Minister is so solicitous of a certain section of race-goers and betters as against all other sections on whom he is particular of increasing the levy. There is a general trend to increase the levy of tax on all other sections of the people, including the rich as well. Then why should the Hon'ble the Finance Minister be solicitous of a particular section of race-goers. That is why I say that this particular measure, this amending Bill, should be circulated for eliciting opinion.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, it is a fundamental proposition that when a Legislature passes a Bill, the legislators must understand what it purports to be. I was anxious to understand the Bill and the so called explanation or the elucidation of the Hon'ble Minister. But the thing is as dark as ever. The objective of the Congress Government is prohibition and prohibition of all betting. That is as I understand it. Betting or horse-racing is prohibited in their terminology. It is their objective. Now this Government comes with a Bill, as my Hon'ble friend Sri. Narasimhan said, with a proposal to decrease taxation on a certain category of people who are in the habit of going to the race course for betting. I am smelling a dead rat there. There is something fishy about it. It may not be so fishy. Just now I am not in a position to know what sort of a dead rat it is. My Hon'ble friend's proposition is that this Bill may be taken after all the implications of the Bill are understood at least by the Honour'ble Members of this House and that suddenly we may not be hustled through to pass the same and this request should be conceded. I do not say this with any other motive except that we wish to pass this measure after understanding its implications. Personally I have not understood its implications, as a lawyer. The Hon'ble Minister may therefore agree to this simple proposal that it may be passed within one or two months after the full implications are known. I fully endorse this proposal of my friend.

*Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the proposition suggested by my Hon'ble friend comrade Narasimhan. I am personally opposed to this Bill. I am surprised to find the Government bringing this legislation. It is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that 'it is considered desirable to specify lesser rates of tax in respect of specified classes of races which will be notified by the Government.' So this Bill seeks to reduce the rates of tax already levied. I submit, Sir, this is highly undesirable. In my opinion, betting and racing are both to be discouraged and taxation should be so devised as to discourage them. If that is the purpose, taxation should be higher rather than lesser. It will be morally wrong to reduce taxation. There are no moral grounds to support this Bill. So, on the moral ground also, I oppose this Bill. It is very well known that the entire Mahabharatha took place on account of this evil betting *dyutha*.

Secondly, I think, Sir, this Bill cannot fit in with the objectives of a socialistic pattern of society which is placed before the nation. Racing is only a luxury of the rich and Government is very fond of taxing the poorer sections of the people just as comrade Narasimhan pointed out a little while ago. When taxes are being increased in the State, I do not understand the propriety of reducing the taxation on a certain class of people who can afford to pay higher tax. This can only be characterised as a concession shown to the richer classes.

Thirdly, Sir, this Bill is trying to confer wide powers on the Government in section 8 A (1). I think it is quite an arbitrary power and my idea is that such wide powers should not be vested in Government.

Taking into consideration all these factors, my honest opinion is that this Bill should not be passed. That is my personal opinion. I am totally opposed to this Bill, particularly as it seeks to reduce the rates of tax on races. At least, I would request the Hon'ble Minister to accept the most reasonable proposition moved by comrade Narasim-

han and agree to send this Bill for circulation.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must admit to a feeling of very great surprise that the present Cabinet has brought forth a Bill like this for consideration before this House. The Statement of Objects and Reasons is rather very cryptic and I am afraid it does not carry conviction at least to this section of the House. It would have been very much better if the Hon'ble Minister for Finance had mentioned at whose instance this amending Bill has been brought for consideration before this House. Whom does it satisfy? Is it intended to satisfy one section of race-goers? Or is it designed to accommodate the Race Club, Bangalore or the Race Club, Mysore? What exactly is the difficulty? At a time when we are hard up for finances and when there is a reasonable prospect of getting more money, why on earth is this proposition being placed before this House for consideration and acceptance? Is it to stabilise the fluctuating fortunes of the Bangalore Race Club that this measure is brought up? I am rather suspicious about the circumstances under which this Bill is placed before this House.

My friend from Maharashtra has given expression to a feeling that it does not fit in with the socialistic pattern of society.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—He is from Mysore State and not from Maharashtra.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Does it mean that I am not a Maharashtrian?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I stand corrected to that extent. But in regard to making a reasonable statement, these linguistic barriers should not worry us. Even though I made a mistake in naming a certain area, he has made a most reasonable statement and he says that this Bill does not conform to any type of socialism or the socialistic pattern of society that the members on the other side wish to establish in the State. I feel that it is a very innocuous statement that has been made by my esteemed friend Sri. Narasimhan that public opinion should be elicited on a

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.)

measure like this before placing it before this House for consideration. In view of this, I would very much wish that the Hon'ble Minister readily accepts this proposition.

Sir, section 3 'validation' seeks to give the widest powers possible to Government and they may do anything between the sessions of the Assembly and it shall be deemed to have been validly made and shall not be called in question in any manner. This omnibus power tends to make us a little more suspicious. This section intends to give a blank cheque to the Government; there is neither warrant nor justification for such a procedure.

In view of all these considerations, I would very much suggest that this Bill may be placed before the public for consideration and it may be taken up in this House some time in April. There is no urgency about it and it could as well wait for a month or two.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಈ ಮೈಸೂರ್ ಬೆಟಿಂಗ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬರ್ 1958 ಇದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರ ಕನಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಕುದುರೆ ಬಂದಿತೋ ತಿಳಿಯದು! ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮನೂವೆಯಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ! ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಟ್ಟದಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮೂಲ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನೇ ಕಿತ್ತುಹಾಕಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಕಾನೂನುನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡುವುದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯೇನು? ಬೆಟಿಂಗ್ ರೇಟ್ ಕಡಿಮೆಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಖೀರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು, ಜೂಜಾಟ ಕೆಟ್ಟದು. ಬೆಟಿಂಗ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕೆಟ್ಟದು, ಅದು ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಸಮುದ್ರ ಮಥನ ಮಾಡಿ ಗ್ಯಾಂಪ್ಲಿಂಗ್, ಕುದುರೆ ಜೂಜು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ, ರೇಟ್ಸ್ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇರುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಕಾಮರಾಜನಾಥರ ಅವರು ಕುದುರೆ ಜೂಜಾಟವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜನತೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ದುರಭ್ಯಾಸಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ, ನಾಟಕ, ಕರೆ, ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ, ಸಂಗೀತ ಮುಂತಾದವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತೇಜನ ಕೊಡದೆ,

ಜೂಜಾಟದ ರೇಟ್ಸ್ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಸರಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಏನು ಸರಕಾರದ ಪಾಲಿನಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ! ಇದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ತತ್ವವೇ! ಮಹಾತ್ಮ ಗಾಂಧೀ ಜಯವರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುವವರಾದ ನೀವು, ನಿಮ್ಮ ನೀತಿ ತತ್ವ ಯಾವುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇದೊಂದು ಮನಿ ಬಿಲ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. This is nothing but a Money Bill. ಅದಕಾರಣ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರುವಾಗ ಗವರ್ನರ ಅನುಮತಿ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಗವರ್ನರ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ದುಡ್ಡು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಬರಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಕಡಿಮೆಬರಲಿ, ಇಂಥ ಮನಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುವಾಗ ಗವರ್ನರ ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದೀರಾ ಅಥವಾ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದರೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಪಡೆದಿರಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ, ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಪಡೆದು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ಶಾಸನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಾ! ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ನೀವು ಏನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಅಬ್ಜೆಕ್ಟಿವ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಉತ್ಕಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಂದಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿದೀರಾ ಎಂದರೆ ಅದೊಂದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಏನೆಂದು ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂದರೆ “ಸೋನೀಕೇ ತರ್ವಾಂ ತಮಾಂಕೇ ಸಿರ್‌ಪುರ ರಪೋ” ಎನ್ನುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗೆ ಬಂದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರು, ಕೋಟಿ ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಡ ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಯಾರಾ ಆ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತ ಜನ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸುಂತನಕರರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ಮಲ್ಟಿರಾಡ್ಗರು, ಸುಂತನಕರರವರು ಮತ್ತು ನರಸಿಂಹರವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಇನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶಕೊಡಿ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸರ್ಯು ರೇಟ್ ಆಗಿ, ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಶೇಖರಣೆಮಾಡಿ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಸಮಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ತನ್ನಿ. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಮಾರಿ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಹೇಗೆ ದೇವರ ತಲೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಹೋಗಿ ತುಂಬೇ ಹೂವನ್ನು ಅರ್ಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಪೂಜೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆ ಬಡ ಜನ ನಮ್ಮ ತಲೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಹೂವು ಹಾಕಿ ಪೂಜೆಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದುಡ್ಡು ಬೇಕು, ನಿಜ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥದೇ ಲಾ ಮಾಡಿ ಹಣಗಳಿಸಬೇಡಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಸಿ ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಪಾರ್ಸಿ; ನೀವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಬರ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ನಿಮಗೆ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥಂಥವರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲಸ

ಅಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಅಚಂದ್ರಾರ್ಕವಾಗಿ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮನ್ನಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ಎಂದು ನಂಬಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).— ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಬೆಟ್ಟಿಂಗ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಾ, ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಭಾರತದ 1953ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯ ಕೊನೆಯೇ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಾವಧಿಯ ಕೊನೆಯಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಹಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಾ ಕಾರವೆಂದು ಜನರನ್ನಾ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಗೆ ಬಟ್ಟೆಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ದಂಗೆ ಎಳೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ನಿದರ್ಶನ ಇರುವಾಗ, ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಹಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಟ್ಟೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಬೆರೆತು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ 10 ಸೇರು ಅಕ್ಕಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ, 4 ಗಜ ಬಟ್ಟೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಬರ್ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಏನು? ಇದರ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲ ಕೊಡದೆ, ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದೆ ಈ ಬರ್ ತಂದಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಆತುರ ಏನಿತ್ತು? ಜೂಜು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತಮ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಆತುರವೇನಿತ್ತು? ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಯ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸುಖ ವಿಚಾರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ದೇಶದ ಜೂಜನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿರುವ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯಾವ ಮಾರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಾಗಿ ಅವರೇ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಇದು ಎತ್ತಿ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ನಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಉತ್ತರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇನ್ನೇವೆ. ಒಂದೊಂದರ ಮೇಲೂ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅನ್ನ, ಬಟ್ಟೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದ ನೀವು ಈಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಗೌರವ, ಘನತೆಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುತ್ತೀರಿ; ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕುಮಾಡದೆ ಜವಾಬು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಟೀಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇಂಥ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಜೂಜಿನ ವಿಷಯ ಏನು ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆಯೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕುದುರೆ ವಿಷಯ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆಯೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಕುದುರೆ ಸವಾರಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಈ ರೇಸ್ ಕ್ಲಬ್ ಇದೆಯಲ್ಲಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ನಾಮಿನೀಸ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕುದುರೆ ಸವಾರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಕ್ಲಬ್‌ಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಕುದುರೆ ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಬೆರೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಸಹ ತಿಳಿದವರು ಇರಬೇಕು. ಕುದುರೆ ಸವಾರಿ ಬರಲಿ,

ಬರದೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಕುದುರೆ ಹತ್ತುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಲಿ, ಬರದೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಲಗಾಮು ಹಿಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಲಿ, ಬರದೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಅಂತಹವರು ನಾಮಿನೀಸ್ ಆಗಿ ಏಕೆ ಇರಬೇಕೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು: ನಾನು ಬಾಲ್ಯದಾರಭ್ಯದಿಂದ ಕುದುರೆ ಸವಾರಾದಾರ. ಈಗ ಹತ್ತು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ನನ್ನ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಕುದುರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡರ ಕಾಣಿಸ್ವಿಟ್ಟುಯೋನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕುದುರೆ ಜೂಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೆ ಕುದುರೆಗಳು ಹೋಗಿ ಬಹುಮಾನ ಪಡೆದು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಅನುಭವ ಇದ್ದವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಅನುಭವ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವವರನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಏಕೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪಟ್ಟಣದ ಮಧ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜೂಜನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿ, ಬಡ ಜನರು ಹೆಂಗಸರು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಒಡವೆ ವಸ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಗಿರವಿ ಇಟ್ಟು ಜೂಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಕಣ್ಣಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವಾಗ—ರೇಸ್‌ಕೋರ್ಸ್ ಮುಂದೆಯೇ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮನೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಆ ಬಡ ಜನತೆಯ ಕಷ್ಟ ನೋಡಿ ಖುಷಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರನ್ನು ಉದ್ಧಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಕಾಣಿಸ್ವಿಟ್ಟುಯೋ ಇದೆ, ಕೆಲವು ವಿವರ ನಡೆಯಬಹುದು, ಆದರೆ ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಾನೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಆಗಿದ್ದೆ, Ex-Minister ಎಂದು ನಾಳೆ ಅಂದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೇ ವಿನಾ ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಉಳಿಯಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದು. ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವವರು, ಅವರ ಪ್ರೀತಿ ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುವವರು ಇದನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಸಂತೋಷಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ಹೊಟ್ಟೆಗೆ, ಬಟ್ಟೆಗೆ, ಉಣಕೆ, ತಿಂಡಿಗೆ, ಏನಾದರೂ ಇದೆಯೇ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ? ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅರ್ಹವಾದಂಥ ವಿಷಯ ಏನಿದೆ? ಅನೇಕ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿಯಿಂದ ನೀವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯಾದ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಬೇರೆ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶಕೊಡಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಕೇಳಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ, ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಶಿಷ್ಟ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಾವಕಾಶಕೊಡಿ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವ ಈ ಬರ್ ಅನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ (ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-ದಕ್ಷಿಣ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ 1958ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕುದುರೆಜೂಜಿನ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನರಸಿಂಹ ಅವರು ತಂತ್ರತತ್ವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.)

ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶಬೇಕು, ಈ ಬರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದೊಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮನೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನು, ಒಳಹೊಕ್ಕು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ ಅಂಶಗಳಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ವೇದ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ತಮಗೆಲ್ಲ ರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವಹಾಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುದುರೆಜೂಜು ಎರಡು ವಿಧವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಜೂಜು ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿ ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುವ ಕುದುರೆಜೂಜು, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಅಧಾದಮೇಲೆ ಜಂಖಾನ ರೇಸಸ್ ಎಂದು ಕುದುರೆ ಗಾಡಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವ ಕುದುರೆಗಳಲ್ಲ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಕುದುರೆಗಳನ್ನಾರಿಸಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದು.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಈಗಿರುವ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವನೂಲಾಗುವ ತೆರಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡೆ 25ಕ್ಕೆ ಮೀರ ದಷ್ಟು ಒಂದೇಒಂದು ನಿಗದಿಯಾದ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿರುವುದು ಒಂದೇಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರ. ಎರಡುವಿಧವಾದ ಕುದುರೆಜೂಜು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಒಂದೇವಿಧವಾದ ತೆರಿಗೆ ವಿಧಿಸುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿವೇಚನೆ ಯನ್ನು ಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಧಿಸಬಹುದು, ಆದಾಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಬರುವ ಕುದುರೆಜೂಜಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು, ಕಡಮೆ ಆದಾಯವಿರುವ ಕಡೆ ಕಡಮೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಕೇಳಿರುವರೇ ಹೊರತು ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೇರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದೇಸಮನಾದ ತೆರಿಗೆ ವಿಧಿಸಿದರೆ ಕುದುರೆಜೂಜು ನಡೆಸುವವರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮರಾಠಾ ರಾಧ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರಿಗೂ ಅನುಭವವುಂಟು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ವಿವೇಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಒಂದೇವಿಧ ವಾದ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎನಾ ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೇರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವ ಜನಿಕರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಿಸಲು ಪ್ರಚಾರಮಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನಮಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಳಅರ್ಥವಿದೆಯೆಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಸೂಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಧಾರ ಎಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹರವರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದು ಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಈಗಲೇ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಜರೂರಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಳೆನರಸೀಪುರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ಪೀಕರರು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರಮಾಡುವುದು ಉಚಿತವೇ ಅಥವಾ ಅನುಚಿತವೇ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಶದವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜನರನ್ನು ಸುಖಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಗುರಿಎಂಬುದು ಅವರ ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಧೈಯಧೋರಣೆಗಳಿಂದ ವ್ಯಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಡೆದ ಇದೇ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಲಾಪಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಟುವಾಗಿ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೂಕೂಡ ಯಾವುದೋಒಂದು ನೆಪದಿಂದ ಕೇವಲ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಂಥ ಮನೋದೆ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಮೂಕವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನೇಕ ಸಂಸಾರಗಳ

ವರು, ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬಡವರು, ಒಂದು ಟಿಮ್‌ಪ್ಲೇಷನಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಜೂಜಾಡಿದರೆ 40 ಅಥವಾ 400 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಬರಬಹುದೆಂಬ ದುರಾಸೆಯ ಪ್ರಯುಕ್ತ ಇರುವ ಅಸ್ತಿಪಾಸ್ತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾರಿಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗಿ ಜೂಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ನಿರಾಶರಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯವಿತ್ತರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಅನೇಕರ ಅನುಭವಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ನಗರದವರು ಕೂಡ ಜೂಜಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಕ್ಕನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಯುವುದು ಉಚಿತವೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇರುವ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಸುಧಾರಿಸಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕಾಯಿದೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿ ಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದು ನೂಕುವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿ, ಧೋರಣೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಜನರ ನೈತಿಕ ಮಟ್ಟ ವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಎಂದು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ವಿಷಯ ಹೀಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕುದುರೆ ಜೂಜನ್ನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಾಜ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯಥೆಪಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರ. ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು ವಿವೇಕವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಕುದುರೆ ಸಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅನುಭವ ಇರುವವರು ಜೂಜಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಿಜ ವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗು ವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸದ ಅನುಭವದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅನೇಕರು ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಹಣ ಮತ್ತು ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ಮೈಮೇಲಿರುವ ಒಡವೆವಸ್ತ್ರ ಮಾರಿ ಅದರಿಂದ ಬರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗಿ ಕುದುರೆ ಜೂಜಾಡಿ ನೋಡುತು ಮನೆಗೆ ಜುಜಕಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗುವು ದಕ್ಕೂ ದುಡ್ಡಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಕಾಫಿ ಕುಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮುಖಕಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಹಿಂತಿರುಗು ತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಬೆಟಿಂಗ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಲು ಮನಸ್ಸುಮಾಡದೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮನೋದೆ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಯಾವ ಸಮತಾವಾದಿ ಸಮಾಜ ರಚನೆಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಅವಡಿ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿನ ಸಾರಿದ್ದರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹರವರೇನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದರೋ ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡದೆ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕನು ಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡೆಯುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಬಹುಶಃ ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಅವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣ ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ (ತಾಳೀಕೋಟೆ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ದಿವಸ ತಂದಿರುವ ಜೂಜಿನ ತೆರಿಗೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ಅಧಃಪತನ ವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಹಾತ್ಮ ಗಾಂಧಿಯವರ ಪೋಲೋಇರುವ ಈ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ತಿದ್ದು ಪಡಿ ತರುವುದು, ಕುಡಿತ, ವೇಶ್ಯಾವೃತ್ತಿ, ಜೂಜಾಟ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡುವುದು ಅನೈತಿಕ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪಾನವಿರೋಧಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರು ವಾಗ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ಕುಡಿತವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಬಂದು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಳ್ಳಬಟ್ಟೆ ಸಾರಾಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ತಯಾರುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕುಡಿತದಿಂದ ಬರುವ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಬಡರಾರದೆ ಬೊಕ್ಕಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ಬರಲೆಂದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ಕುಡಿತವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ದುರ್ವ್ಯಸನವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿದೆ.

ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮಾಜವಾದಿ ನಮಾಜ ರಚನೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈಹಾಕಿರುವ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರ, ಗಾಂಧಿ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ನುಸರಿಸುವ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷ, ಈ ರೀತಿ ತೆರಿಗೆಹಾಕುವುದು ದುರ್ವ್ಯಸನದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ತ್ಯಾಜ್ಯ ಅದೆ; ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರೇಯಸ್ಕರವಲ್ಲ, ಜನತೆಯ ಪ್ರೇಮ ತಪ್ಪುತ್ತದೆ. ಕುಡಿತದಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಸಂಸಾರಗಳು ಹಾಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಜೂಜಿ ನಿಂದಲೂ ಹಾನಿಯಿದೆ. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವ ಅನೈತಿಕ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಸುವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣ ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri F. H. MOHSIN (Hubli City).—Sir. I rise to oppose the amendment moved by Sri M. C. Narasimhan.

The Bill is so simple in that it wants to make a difference in classes of races. There are races run by Gymkhana Club and other clubs. Races run by certain clubs have to be differentiated and given some concessions also. With this object in view this amending Bill has been brought.

Many of my friends on the opposite side have spoken in favour of prohibiting betting on horses. True, I am also of the opinion that betting on horses should be prohibited. But that is not the question before us. The Act is there and we want to seek amendment for making certain concessions to the races conducted by particular clubs. A time may come when a Bill may be placed before us to consider whether all the races should be stopped once for all. I personally feel that this side also will support that kind of Bill. But, today, as the Bill stands, we have to see whether certain class of races will have to be given concession or not. I find no reason for giving concession to certain class of races. Clause 3-Validation says that a certain order passed in 57 showing certain concession should be considered to have been validly made. I personally feel that that order of Government should not have been passed before being made valid. In my opinion, the passing such orders should not be repeated in future and amendments sought afterwards to validate such orders which otherwise would not have been valid.

With these observations I support the Bill brought by the Hon'ble Minister.

*Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—My motion is that the Bill be circulated for

eliciting opinion. I do not think we will be precluded, after the discussion is over, from making a comment on the principles enunciated in the Bill in a general way.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member will see that he has tabled an amendment. The amendment and the main motion are before the House.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್ ಶಂಕರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಸದುರ್ಗ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಗಳ ನೀತಿ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ಯಮವೆಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ವಿಷಯವೆಲ್ಲ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಜೂಜಿನ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಇಳಿಸಿದರೆ, ಕಟ್ಟಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥವರಿಗೆ, ದೇಶದಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮಧ್ಯವರ್ತಿ ಜನಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಜೀವನವನ್ನು ಹಾಳು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಉದ್ಯಮಕ್ಕೆ, ಉತ್ತೇಜನಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೊದಲು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಲಬ್ಬುಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲರಾದರೂ ಇನ್ನಿಷ್ಟು ಅಡಿದರೆ ಪೊಲೀಸಿನವರು ಕೇಸ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್, ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಐವತ್ತು ಅರವತ್ತು ಕ್ಲಬ್ ಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ದರೋಡೆಲೂಟಗಳು ಜಾಸಿ ಯಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿವೆಲ್ಲ ಇರುವ ಕ್ಲಬ್ಬುಗಳ, ಲಸನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. 25 ಕ್ಲಬ್ಬುಗಳ ಇವೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅರುಕ್ಕುಬ್ಬುಗಳಿವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೀತಿಯ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗಿ ಜೂಜಾಟದ ಕ್ಲಬ್ಬುಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಜಾಸಿಯಾಗಿವೆ. ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಜನ ಹಾಳಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಆದಾಯ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜೂಜುತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ಜೂಜಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಕ್ಕುವುದಾದರೆ, ಈಗ ಶೇಕಡ 25 ಜನ ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೀಡಾದರೆ, ಇನ್ನು ಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಶೇಕಡ 60ಕ್ಕೆ ಏರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೆಶೆಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ಎರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall first put the amendment of Sri Narasimhan. The question is :

“That the Mysore Betting Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1958, be circulated for eliciting opinion.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Betting Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Since there are no amendments I shall put all the clauses.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I invite your attention to rule 53 (2). Under that I have given notice of a motion for eliciting public opinion. Now that motion has been put to the House.

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.)

Whenever a Bill is introduced our rules provide for discussion at two stages; one is for general participation in the debate before taking up the Bill clause by clause and the other is at the stage of consideration of the motion for eliciting public opinion. It appears from your ruling, Sir, that the second right is sought to be taken away. Rule 53 (3) is clear on the point.

“On the day on which any motion that the Bill be taken into consideration by the Assembly either at once or at some future day is moved, the principle of the Bill and its general provisions may be discussed, but the details of the Bill shall not be discussed further than is necessary to explain its principles.”

Rules 53(2) and (3) are entirely different. Under 53(2) I moved that the Bill be circulated for eliciting opinion. Now the Bill is before the House for consideration. At this stage rule 53(3) comes into operation and we have a right to discuss the general principles involved. It is only afterwards that consideration of clauses by one by one can be taken. I should like you to give a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Shri Narasimhan has read rule 53(3) of the old copy. Sub-rule (3) of rule 51 says:

“...the principle of the Bill and its general provisions may be discussed, but the details of the Bill shall not be discussed further than is necessary to explain its principles”.

That means the scope of discussion at the consideration stage should be limited to general provisions. But, now the Bill and also the amendment is before the House for consideration. When the Bill was before the House the Hon'ble Members ought to have made remarks on that. But they did not make, but confined their remarks only to the amendment. That has been a mistake. The stage of consideration is over and we are in the stage of reading the Bill clause by clause. If the Hon'ble Mem-

ber wants to make any remarks on any of the clauses, he is at liberty to do so but he cannot make general remarks.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—On a point of explanation, Sir. Even at the beginning itself while moving the amendment for consideration, I confined my remarks as to why the Bill should be circulated for eliciting public opinion. I wanted to make remarks in regard to general principles at a later stage. I thought it was my amendment that was being discussed and not the other. The very fact that my amendment was put to vote itself shows that the discussion under debate was confined only to my amendment and not to the other amendment. Now that the Bill is taken up for clause by clause consideration. I crave the indulgence of the Chair to permit us to offer our general remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even that stage is over. The Hon'ble Member may offer his remarks on the clause. The important clause of the Bill is Clause 2. The Hon'ble Member may make his remarks on that. I will now put the clause.

Motion moved:

“That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill”.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I oppose clause (2) of the Bill for the following reasons. This clause which is the important clause of the amending Bill provides for reducing the rate of totalisator tax and betting tax payable in respect of such classes of races as may be specified in the notification. There is one technical difficulty in respect of this matter. The original Act of 1932 (the Mysore Betting Tax Act 1932) and the 1952 Act (Race Course licensing Act) provide for no classification in respect of races. I shall make my position clear by reading the relevant definition under those Acts.

“2(2) “horse-race” means any race in which any horse, mare or gelding runs, or is made to run, in competition with any other horse, mare or gelding for any prize of whatsoever nature or kind, or for any bet or wager made or to be made in respect of any such horse,”

mare or gelding or the riders thereof, and at which more than twenty persons shall be present;”

In the 1932 Act also there is only a reference to Racing Club. But even the amendment which has been introduced later on does not specify as to which are the classes of races. So far as the present Act is concerned, it does not provide for any reasonable classifications for the simple reason that whether it is a race-horse racing or Jamkhana racing, the principle involved is just the same. In betting there is no difference between betting by a poor man and a rich man. Betting is based on the principle that one man's gain is another man's loss. No other principle or ethics is involved. That is the reason why earlier there was no reasonable classification provided for various kinds of races. Therefore, I cannot understand why in an amending Bill without amending the relevant definition, the Government tries to provide for classification of races.

That is one technical aspect which I want to submit. I say on that account this clause would be out of order and is not in conformity with the previous Act or the legislative competence of this House.

Now my second point is this. I cannot understand why this clause is introduced even on grounds of policy. Because for the past 25 years, i.e., since the year 1932-33, since 1st February 1933, this betting tax was enforced. Section 3 and section 6 of that Act provided for a rate of tax not to exceed 25 per cent of the return either on the betting or on the totalisators. So, for the past 25 years, by virtue of this legislation our former State was earning returns, fairly substantial returns. I shall make it clear. The returns for the various years; if I may submit, were ranging from 14 lakhs to 8 lakhs. It was 14.67 lakhs in 48-49 and it was in the order of 8.94 lakhs during 1955-56. There was a decrease in the returns because in the year 1955-56, rates on the totalisator and betting taxes were reduced to about 12½ per cent or thereabouts. Because of the reduction in the rate, there was a

reduction in the returns. I wish to submit that the revenues were of the order of fourteen to eight lakhs. It is not a small sum. It is not a sum which could be treated as negligible. In view of these huge returns, what is the urgency involved for the Government to come forward to say that this should be amended and that the rates of taxes should be reduced. There is a further reason for opposing the Bill. Supposing the tax is reduced as the Government wants to; what would happen? There are two possibilities? One is that the returns might get reduced or the Government might come forward and say that if the tax is reduced the returns might be more. But it is a fallacious argument. So far as the race goers are concerned—I am not one—it is this. There is a particular class or people subject to certain psychological complexes who would like to go to races. It may be on the one hand the richer section or it may be on the other hand the poorer section. It is these two sections that go. You may introduce any taxes. You may increase the rate of taxes or you may lower the rate of taxes. Still it would be convenient for this section to attend the races, this section which suffers, from psychological complexes and which would feel that by betting it can make a large amount of money and it is only that section that attends the races. By reducing the tax, you cannot attract more number of people. That is one thing. The second possibility is this. There is that danger—I am only speaking of the possible danger. I am not placing this as a certainty and it is this. Supposing you reduce the taxes on gymkhana races. It is likely that more people might go casually for pleasure. That is, in other words, the State is trying through this particular piece of legislation to encourage a certain section of people who are placed at a disadvantage socially and economically to go to the races and to bet and thereby lose their money, because the possibility in most of the races is that 99 out of 100 would lose the money. This is based not merely on the principle of ‘one man's gain is another man's loss.’ On the

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.)

other hand, one man's gain is the loss of hundred others. Even on that count also, you see no justification for reduction of taxes on this particular class of people.

Now, the third thing is—I would have welcomed this amendment on another count if there were some other subsidiary clause. Let us look at it from the point of reason. We have today 1952 legislation and the 1932 legislation. It is getting us eight lakhs. There is much leakage of revenue in relation to this particular tax. Bucket shops are outside the Race Course Enclosure. There is a penal provision in the 1932 Act and also in the 1952 Act. 1932 Act provides that if any person contravenes, he shall be subject to fine. . . . and etc. But in the new Bill it is stated. . . "totalisator tax and betting tax payable in respect of such classes of races as may be specified in the notification." All this thing is confined to a particular enclosure. Supposing betting or such transactions as related to totalisator take place outside the enclosure, there is nothing that the Government can do. The penal provision can never be applied to such a person who is betting outside the enclosure. Betting outside the enclosure can never be booked. I am told that it is through this that there is a very heavy leakage of revenue. Suppose Government wanted to plug that leakage. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to bring to your notice one major factor. After all, we are not discussing the betting tax. As the Hon'ble Member knows the whole of Betting Tax Act is not before us. We are only concerned with the reduction of the totalisator's tax. The Hon'ble Member may offer his remarks in regard to the reduction, whether he wants reduction, or if he does not, why not. The whole sphere of the betting tax is not before us.

A MEMBER:—Bucket ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Buckets are also not before us.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I want to bring this fact to the notice of the Government only from the financial point of view. I thought that the Finance Minister would be interested. Anyhow I will not traverse the ground which is not supposed to be covered by me. Lastly, my submission therefore is, that this clause which seeks to reduce the tax in relation to the different categories of races is not at all valid and is not one which should be brought for the consideration of the House. I have one point. The law as it stood earlier, i.e., section 3 and section 6 of Regulation No. 9 of 1932 and the Race Courses Legislation of 1952, were approved by the Taxation Enquiry Commission. The principles underlying those clauses were approved by the Mysore Finance Enquiry Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are not discussing that.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—What I am submitting is that such weighty authorities as the Taxation Enquiry Commission and the Mysore Finance Enquiry Committee looked into the particular Act prevailing. Sections 3 and 6 are revenue yielding sections and that is important. These two bodies which were competent to speak on the subject had definitely stated that this particular tax and the returns therein should not be disturbed. It was in accordance with the Taxation Enquiry Commission and so it should stand without the proposed amendment.

12 NOON

Now I would like to know from the Finance Minister as to the reason why this particular statute is being amended to the detriment of the exchequer.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, I am indeed very grateful to my Hon'ble friends who have participated in such large numbers in the discussion of this very simple Bill. I must also be thankful to the Chair for allowing members a little more scope for discussion at this stage. I am sure Sir, the members will appreciate the indulgence you have shown which has enabled the House to

discuss the Bill in its entirety and when we come to the stage of taking up clause by clause, the scope is well-known. I will not go beyond that.

But anyhow Sir, I am unable to accept the contentions that have been placed before the House. There is considerable mixing up of ideas and I will not deal with the ethics of betting being proper or improper, because I am indeed taken in by the warmth of the feeling expressed by several members on the opposite. But I would like to know where this feeling had gone during all the time the original Bill remained on the Statute Book and I cannot really understand why this warmth of feeling did not rouse them to introduce a private Bill to amend the provisions of the original Bill. Having been silent all the time, I do not know how it is relevant for them to come out with this kind of a feeling in respect of the present Bill and it is rather difficult for me to understand. Anyway, if Hon'ble Members are so much agitated about the passing of this Bill, I hope that this warmth will continue and prompt them to bring up a Bill at an early date when I will move that it may be circulated for eliciting public opinion.

Sir, coming to the points raised, I should say, Sir, that Prohibition should not be compared to this. Prohibition is totally different. Heretere is an element of sport. I am sure my Hon'ble friend Sri J. B. Mallaradhya who is a sportsman will very easily understand the distinction between prohibition and sport.

Sir, it was said that the amendment proposed to a money bill requires the previous sanction of the Governor. I would only wish to clarify the reference made to article 207 (1) proviso:

“207(1)*** Provided that no recommendation shall be required under this clause for the moving of an amendment making provision for the reduction or abolition of any tax.”

The next point that was raised was that there was a statutory provision

made in the existing Act to classify races. I do not know whether there is much force in that contention. We all know what races are. At any rate, my friends who have participated in such great detail, I presume, know what races are and in a perfect manner also. Any way that it is unnecessary to give statutory right to Government to classify races, I am unable to follow. Government has got a right and Government can classify. To say under this provision under this statute that Government are trying to clothe themselves with powers to classify and Government have no right to classify, is something very fallacious. I am unable, with all respect to my friend Sri. Narasimhan, to agree that it is not necessary to provide for that Races are known. The data are known classification is simple. To say that Government will neither have the wisdom nor the reasonableness is more attributable to a certain degree of ignorance of the basic facts.

Sir, it was said that, so far as the policy was concerned, it would not be conducive to the socialistic pattern. I am really surprised, because the policy is very simple. As to whether the tax should continue or not is a matter which I think is decided. Do my friends want more money to be collected or do they say that poor man should not be taxed. If a taxation measure is introduced, poor man must not be taxed, is what they say. There is nothing like poor or rich so far as the tax is concerned. It is for the poor man not to go to races. Whether a particular man pays or not is not the concern of this House. Therefore, it is some sort of confused thinking to say that the poor will be taxed, and in another breath to say, 'do not tax the poor man'. Let him have a little drink and a little relaxation. I do not know whether races are so bad. I do not know much about races. All that I have seen is the horses in the streets and never inside an enclosure.

My friend Sri. Narasimhan referred to finances and said that there would be loss to the exchequer. I am really surprised at that. If he carefully

(SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA)

analyses the existing taxes in this State and in the neighbouring States and sees what exactly is the gulf, he will be able to see why it was introduced there as 25—12½ per cent. If he still feels that Races should be prohibited, it is different. But I might also say, Sir, that there is no fixity of thought on this particular point. We will have to wait and see.

Sir, passing further, he referred to Finance Commission and said that the rate should not be cut down since it is likely to bring down the revenue. Whether it is going to reduce the revenue or not is the point. But then my friend may also remember that in the classification, there is the question of validation and it was done in 1957. Nobody raised any objection. It was there and they had done it on that basis this year. Then it was said there is leakage, I have not heard of leakage with regard to this. But if any Hon'ble friends have any facts with them to prove this, I would like to be enlightened and I will be grateful to them. I am certain and I am anxious to prevent leakage anyway. By simply saying that there is leakage, no purpose will be served. If there are bucket shops outside operating outside the ambit of law, well, the Government is perfectly willing to take action. If in spite of the law enacted, there are some people who are trying to run these things, I really cannot see why the statute should be changed. It will be a question of enforcement and I will be grateful on behalf of the Government to have information of the particular places where these bucket shops exist.

Sir, I really do not feel that there is anything said on merits with regard to this particular amendment which has been brought.

Finally, Sir, I am afraid my Hon'ble friend Sri Srinivāsa Setty smelt a dead rat! I may assure him that the House is very clean and there is no rat here. Anyhow I may say this, because he has read the previous Act and that Act does not fix any definite rate.

It says: "not exceeding 25 per cent." It is wide enough and Government could act on that. But this Bill is brought by way of abundant caution.

Therefore, all the criticism that has been levelled for which I am very grateful is directed to putting it in a wrong place. I must say Sir, that Government have brought this amendment after mature consideration and placed a Bill before this House. I am sure that after the explanation which I have submitted for your kind consideration, the Hon'ble Members will all agree that it is perfectly proper and will accept it.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Betting Tax (Amendment) Bill 1958 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clauses. Clause 2. The question is:

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clause 3. The question is:

"That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, I move:

"That the Mysore Betting Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1958 be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Betting Tax
(Amendment) Bill, 1958 be
passed.”

now rise and meet at 1 P.M. on Monday,
the 3rd March 1958.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The other Bill was
not meant to be taken and will not
be taken up today. Somehow it has
been put down in the List of Business
for today. Therefore, the House will

*The House adjourned at Fifteen Minutes
past Twelve of the Clock to meet again
at One of the Clock on Monday, the 3rd
March 1958.*
